

Emerson v. Thiel Coll., 296 F.3d 184, 190 (3d Cir. 2002); it appearing that to dismiss a bankruptcy appeal for lack of prosecution, the Court must consider the six factors laid identified in *Poulis v. State Farm Fire & Cas. Co.*, 747 F.2d 863 (3d Cir. 1984)): (i) “the extent of the party’s personal responsibility;” (ii) the prejudice caused to adversaries caused by appellant's failure to prosecute; (iii) the party’s “history of dilatoriness;” (iv) “whether the conduct of the party or the attorney was willful or in bad faith;” (v) effectiveness of other sanctions; and (vi) “meritoriousness of the claim or defense.” *Emerson*, 296 F.3d at 190 (citing *Poulis*, 747 F.2d at 868); it appearing that Appellant is personally responsible for his failure to prosecute this action, as he is proceeding *pro se* and responsible for pursuing this action, see *Bembry-Muhammad v. Greenberg*, No. 15-8829, 2016 WL 4744139, at *2 (D.N.J. Sept. 12, 2016) (dismissing appeal where “the Appellant is proceeding *pro se*, the duty to properly prosecute the appeal fell on her, and thus she is personally responsible for the failure to timely perfect this appeal and to properly serve the Appellee”); it further appearing that the appellee is prejudiced due to Appellant’s failure to prosecute, as Appellant has not identified the issues on appeal, which both precludes the appellee from defending the appeal on the merits, and prevents this Court from assessing the meritoriousness of Appellant’s claims; it further appearing that Appellant’s failure to prosecute was willful, as he is ostensibly aware of the deadlines imposed by the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy having adhered to them in another case before this Court, see *In re 40 Lakeview Drive, LLC*, No. 15-14692, 2018 WL 10150481, at *2 (D.N.J. June 28, 2018) (“The Appellant is well-aware of the requirements and deadlines set forth in the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, in view of this past experience. Thus, the Appellant is personally responsible for the failure to timely proceed with the prosecution of her appeal.”); it further appearing that Appellant is proceeding *pro se* and has filed bankruptcy thus, monetary sanctions would likely be ineffective, see *Guiuan v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, No. 18-11423, 2020

